take place after wide publicity is given to the fact and it takes place at such spots as would realise good sales for the property. Therefore it is to the advantage of the persons whose land is being sold as well as of Government that the auction should be held where competition will be the keenest, where there will be most people and where there is most money. If you go to an out-of-the-way place for an auction, the chances are very remote that there will be keen competition or the realisation of anything like an adequate price. Therefore I do not think that suggestion of yours can be accepted as an absolute rule.

Another point is in respect of Section 33 of the Revenue Recovery Regulation that the period of setting aside of sale in case of interested persons shall be extended and on sufficient grounds the delay shall be excused. As a matter of fact Section 60 does not fix any time limit. It is left to the Dewan to fix the time. If you wish it, I can fix 2 years as regards disposal of petitions. As regards fixing of a definite period in the case of the puduval rules, the present time limit of 30 days appears to be ample and I do not think it is necessary or advisable to extend it.

You next come to the question of the commutation rate of paddy of 6 fanams per para. You want it to be reduced. This matter was carefully considered and the commutation rate of 6 fanams is perfectly fair and reasonable and as nearly as the *nirak* could possibly be brought. You say that the rate should be reduced; I do not know on what basis. It may be right if you base it on one particular season or one particular crop. On the other hand, you have yourselves catalogued a long list of advantages which the country has secured from the change of payment in kind to payment in coin. I do not think that a single Kandukrishi taxpayer who is given the alternative to choose from today would prefer to go back to the payment in kind.

4. Registry of poramboke lands lying within the boundaries of properties as per Ayacut.

MR. AUGASTHY MATHAN (*Member, Meenachil taluk, Group I*) said that certain lands which were included in the *Olugu* of 1012 and were occupied and cultivated by ryots were in the settlement of 1080 treated as poramboke lands and the ryots in possession of these lands were now being turned out and punished as trespassers. This was very hard. The member requested that the lands might be registered in the names of their occupants.

DEWAN'S REPLY: Mr. Augasthy Mathan, I gather from what you say that you wish that poramboke lands lying within registered holdings should be given to the neighbouring owners. There are not many such cases and if such cases there are, they are entirly due to a mistake made at the time of the last Settlement and whenever such errors are brought to the notice of the revenue authorities, every attempt is made to rectify the mistake and throw open such areas to registration. I shall have the correction of such errors proceeded with as much as possible.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly